



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/518,416	12/17/2004	Antti Heikkinen	FORSAL-98	6753				
36528	7590	08/27/2007						
STIENNON & STIENNON 612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201 P.O. BOX 1667 MADISON, WI 53701-1667			<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">HALPERN, MARK</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		HALPERN, MARK	
EXAMINER								
HALPERN, MARK								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1731</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1731		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
1731								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>08/27/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	08/27/2007	PAPER	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
08/27/2007	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/518,416

Applicant(s)

HEIKKINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Halpern

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-35, 43-54 and 56-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-54 and 56-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1) Applicant's election without traverse of invention I, drawn on claims 29-35, in the reply filed on 8/8/2007, is acknowledged. Claims 29-31 are amended.

Claims 36-42, 55 are cancelled. Claims 43-54, 56-58 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2) Claims 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 29 is not clear; in lines 1-2 recites "...controlling the moisture profile or moisture gradient...", however, in line 16 recites "...controlling the moisture gradient..." only. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1731

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3) Claims 29-35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heikkinen (WO 01/23666) in view of Taylor (5,065,673). Heikkinen discloses a method of controlling the moisture profile or gradient in a process of making a SC quality web as the web is passing through a multi-roll calendar shown in Figure 1. The web is pre-moistened prior to entering nip N between rolls 3 and 4 of the first set A of calendar rolls and then the web undergoes intermediate moistening from moistening unit 7 located between the first A and the second B set of rolls. The multi-stage moistening allows the moistening to be applied substantially only to the surface of the fibrous web and enables the moisture gradient of the web to be controlled. The web undergoes heating from roll 4 before leaving the calendar rolls set B with a final moisture value for roll-up R. The moistening of the web is performed in the running and cross directions. Heikkinen does not show pre-moistening of the web based on the calculated or measured value of the final web moisture. A control setup for influencing the moisture of a web at an earlier or intermediate stage of calendaring based on the web final moisture in a multi-roll calendar is shown in Figure 1 of Taylor. It would have been obvious to try to move the early moistening control to prior to the first calendaring of the web since Taylor does not point out any unusual results by the present early moistening location. Heikkinen and Taylor disclose the elements of the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements by known methods since the combination of Heikkinen and Taylor is a combination of known methods, and each element combined would have performed the same function as it did separately,

Art Unit: 1731

and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4) Claims 29-35 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-44 of copending Application No. 10/598664. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present application and the copending disclose the process of making a paper wherein in the step of calendering over a multi-roll calender, web pre-moistening, web intermediate moistening and control of the pre-moisturizing takes place based on the final moisture value of the web.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

5) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone no. is 571-272-1190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Mark Halpern/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1731